



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|

10/562,371

07/21/2006

Peter John Hastwell

13004.5

6265

757 7590 06/09/2010
BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, IL 60610

EXAMINER

MUMMERT, STEPHANIE KANE

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1637

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/09/2010

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. 10/562,371 | Applicant(s) HASTWELL ET AL. | |
| | Examiner STEPHANIE K. MUMMERT | Art Unit 1637 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 March 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4/21/10;4/13/10;3/16/10</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's amendment filed on March 16, 2010 is acknowledged and has been entered. Claims 1 and 5-13 have been amended. Claim 14 has been added. Claims 1-14 are pending.

Claims 1-14 are discussed in this Office action.

All of the amendments and arguments have been thoroughly reviewed and considered but are not found persuasive for the reasons discussed below. Any rejection not reiterated in this action has been withdrawn as being obviated by the amendment of the claims. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

This action is made FINAL as necessitated by Amendment.

New Grounds of Rejection

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over McEntee et al. (2004/0050701, March 2004; 102(e) date September 13, 2002) as applied to claims 1-5, 7-9 and

Art Unit: 1637

11-13 and further in view of Stolka et al. (US Patent 4,265,990; May 1981). McEntee teaches formation of arrays through electrostatic guidance of ionic samples (Abstract).

McEntee renders obvious all of the limitations of claims 1-5, 7-9 and 11-13. However, McEntee does not specifically teach the conductive layer and components of the chemical layer as claimed below. Stolka teaches a variety of photoconductive materials (Abstract).

With regard to claim 14, Stolka teaches an embodiment of claim 9, wherein the organic photoconductive materials comprise polyvinylcarbazole (PNK) or complexes of polyvinylcarbazole sensitized with trinitrofluorenone (col. 10, lines 47-51, where a mixture of polyvinyl carbazole and trinitrofluorenone are used for charge transfer complexes).

It would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have adjusted the teachings of McEntee to include the specific photoconductive materials claimed as taught by Stolka to arrive at the claimed invention with a reasonable expectation for success. As taught by Stolka, “Intermolecular charge transfer complexes such as a mixture of poly(N-vinylcarbazole) (PVK) and trinitrofluorenone (TNF) may be used as charge generating materials. These materials are capable of injecting photogenerated holes into the transport material” (col. 10, lines 47-51). Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to have adjusted the teachings of McEntee to include the specific photoconductive materials claimed as taught by Stolka to arrive at the claimed invention with a reasonable expectation for success.

Information Disclosure Statement

Art Unit: 1637

The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on March 16, 2010; April 13, 2010; and April 21, 2010 were filed in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97.

Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Previous Grounds of Rejection

Claim Interpretation

The term “dielectric layer” is not explicitly defined in the specification. In particular, the term is not explicitly claimed as distinct from the photoconductive layer. For example, the specification states "On the conductive layer 5 there is a dielectric layer 7, the dielectric layer 7 is preferably a photoconductor, that is a layer of a material which can hold an electric charge and be discharged to the conductive layer 5 when light or other electromagnetic radiation impinges upon it" (paragraph 64). The specification also states, “The dielectric or photoconductive layer may be of a material which is adapted to have a charge pattern formed thereon on by selective discharging an already charged surface upon incident radiation impinging thereon” (paragraph 44). Therefore, the term is being given the broadest reasonable interpretation as reading on either an additional layer explicitly defined as a dielectric layer, or as interchangeable with a photoconducting layer, as recited in claim 8, for example, where the photoconducting layer is a dielectric layer.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-5, 7-9, 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by McEntee et al. (2004/0050701, March 2004; 102(e) date September 13, 2002). McEntee teaches formation of arrays through electrostatic guidance of ionic samples (Abstract).

With regard to claim 1, McEntee teaches a substrate adapted for selective micron and nanometer scale deposition, the substrate having; a support (p. 6-7, where the conductive and photoconductive layers are on the support, 110, see Figure 1); a conductive layer on the support (p. 6-7, where the conductive layer, 120, overlays the support); a dielectric layer of a material which will hold an electrostatic charge, the dielectric layer disposed on the conductive layer (p. 6-7, where the photoconductive layer, 130, overlays the conductive layer; p. 5, [43] where the support can be patterned through illumination with light and where the photoconductive layer is interpreted as interchangeable with the dielectric layer claimed, see claim interpretation); and a chemically functional layer, on the dielectric layer, the chemically functional layer providing a protective layer for the dielectric layer and a chemically reactive surface for compounds deposited on the surface (p. 6, [47], [50], where the support “guides the ionized droplet of the material to preferentially deposit on an illuminated location or a non-illuminated location of the surface... due to electrostatic force” and “the deposited material chemically bonds to the

Art Unit: 1637

photoconductive layer surface at the preferred location”, therefore the photoconductive layer includes a chemical layer that provides a reactive surface for compounds deposited on the surface; [57], where the photoconductive layer is protected); whereby the substrate is capable of having electrostatic charge patterns formed in a predetermined manner thereupon or therein (p. 5, [43], where the support, particularly the photoconductive layer, can be patterned with electric charge; p. 5, [41] where the support guides droplet placement on an array surface; p. 2, [14] where the deposition sites are present in an array or predetermined format on the substrate).

With regard to claim 2, McEntee teaches an embodiment of claim 1 wherein the support is selected from the group comprising a metal, glass, ceramic, or polymeric material and the support is clear or opaque and flexible or rigid (p. 4, [38] where the substrate can be of any suitable material, emits low fluorescence and is relatively transparent).

With regard to claim 3, McEntee teaches an embodiment of claim 1 wherein the conductive layer is combined with the support (p. 1 [10], p. 6-7, where the substrate includes an attached or combined conductive layer).

With regard to claim 4, McEntee teaches an embodiment of claim 1 wherein the conductive layer is a very thin layer and is transparent (p. 9, [72], where thin film fabrication is well known; p. 11, [83] where “the apparatus 200 can be manufactured using well-known optical transparent substrate materials and using optical transparent electrically conducting materials”).

With regard to claim 5, McEntee teaches an embodiment of claim 1 wherein the conductive layer is vacuum-deposited onto the support (p. 9, [72], where the substrate is coated using a variety of techniques for deposition including forming a thin film; and where it is noted that the claim is drawn to a product by process and absent a showing that the process of applying

Art Unit: 1637

the conductive layer imposes a structural difference in the final product, any type of deposition which places the conductive layer on the substrate anticipates the claim).

With regard to claim 7, McEntee teaches an embodiment of claim 1 wherein the dielectric layer comprises a material selected from the group consisting of a glass, a polymeric resin and a methylmethacrylate (MMA) (p. 5, [43] where the dielectric layer is interpreted as interchangeable with photoconductor, and where the photoconductor includes amorphous silica, a type of glass or resin).

With regard to claim 8, McEntee teaches an embodiment of claim 1 wherein the dielectric in the dielectric layer comprises a photoconductor (p. 6-7, where the photoconductive layer, 130, overlays the conductive layer; p. 5, [43] where the support can be patterned through illumination with light and where the photoconductive layer is interpreted as interchangeable with the dielectric layer claimed, see claim interpretation).

With regard to claim 9, McEntee teaches an embodiment of claim 8 wherein the photoconductor is selected from the group comprising zinc oxide, cadmium sulphide, lead sulphide, lead selenide, amorphous selenium, doped selenium, alloys of selenium including selenium-tellurium, selenium-arsenic, organic photoconductive materials (p. 5, [43] where the photoconductor includes zinc oxide and selenium).

With regard to claim 11, McEntee teaches a substrate having;
a support (p. 6-7, where the conductive and photoconductive layers are on the support, 110, see Figure 1); a conductive layer on the support (p. 6-7, where the conductive layer, 120, overlays the support);

Art Unit: 1637

a photoconductive layer of a material which is adapted to have an electrostatic charge thereon selectively dissipated upon receiving incident radiation, the photoconductive layer disposed on the conductive layer (p. 6-7, where the photoconductive layer, 130, overlays the conductive layer; p. 5, [43] where the support can be patterned through illumination with light);

and a chemically functional layer on the photoconductive layer, the chemically functional layer providing a protective layer for the photoconductive layer and a chemically reactive surface for compounds deposited on the surface (p. 6, [47], [50], where the support “guides the ionized droplet of the material to preferentially deposit on an illuminated location or a non-illuminated location of the surface... due to electrostatic force” and “the deposited material chemically bonds to the photoconductive layer surface at the preferred location”, therefore the photoconductive layer includes a chemical layer that provides a reactive surface for compounds deposited on the surface; [57], where the photoconductive layer is protected);

whereby the substrate is capable of having electrostatic charge patterns formed in a selected array thereupon to influence the movement of charged droplets in a liquid medium on the substrate (p. 5, [43], where the support, particularly the photoconductive layer, can be patterned with electric charge; p. 5, [41] where the support guides droplet placement on an array surface).

With regard to claim 12, McEntee teaches a substrate adapted for manufacture of DNA arrays, the substrate having:

a support (p. 6-7, where the conductive and photoconductive layers are on the support, 110, see Figure 1); a conductive layer on the support (p. 6-7, where the conductive layer, 120, overlays the support);

Art Unit: 1637

a photoconductive layer of a material which is adapted to have an electrostatic charge thereon dissipated upon receiving incident radiation, the photoconductive layer disposed on the conductive layer (p. 6-7, where the photoconductive layer, 130, overlays the conductive layer; p. 5, [43] where the support can be patterned through illumination with light);

and a chemically functional layer on the photoconductive layer, the chemically functional layer providing a protective layer for the photoconductive layer (p. 6, [47], [50], where the support “guides the ionized droplet of the material to preferentially deposit on an illuminated location or a non-illuminated location of the surface... due to electrostatic force” and “the deposited material chemically bonds to the photoconductive layer surface at the preferred location”, therefore the photoconductive layer includes a chemical layer that provides a reactive surface for compounds deposited on the surface; [57], where the photoconductive layer is protected);

whereby the substrate is capable of having electrostatic charge patterns formed in a selected array thereupon to influence the movement of charged droplets in a liquid medium on the substrate (p. 5, [43], where the support, particularly the photoconductive layer, can be patterned with electric charge; p. 5, [41] where the support guides droplet placement on an array surface);

the chemically functional layer comprising at least in part a chemically active material to which a molecule can be attached, the molecule selected from the group consisting of a binder molecule and a binder molecule with at least one DNA oligomer joined thereto, whereby the substrate is capable of having a selected electric charge pattern generated thereupon by incident radiation to enable selective chemical de-protection of the binder molecule or the at least one

Art Unit: 1637

DNA oligomer already joined to the binder molecule (p. 5, [43], where the support, particularly the photoconductive layer, can be patterned with electric charge; p. 5, [41] where the support guides droplet placement on an array surface; p. 11, [84] where the array is used for binding DNA oligomers to the array).

With regard to claim 13, McEntee teaches a substrate adapted for manufacture of DNA arrays, the substrate having:

a support (p. 8, legend to Figure 5A, where the layers are on a support); a conductive layer on the support (p. 6-7, where the conductive layer, 120, overlays the support);

a photoconductive layer of a material which is adapted to have an electrostatic charge thereon selectively dissipated upon receiving incident radiation, the photoconductive layer disposed on the conductive layer (p. 6-7, where the photoconductive layer, 130, overlays the conductive layer; p. 5, [43] where the support can be patterned through illumination with light);

and a chemically functional layer on the photoconductive layer, the chemically functional layer providing a protective layer for the photoconductive layer (p. 6, [47], [50], where the support “guides the ionized droplet of the material to preferentially deposit on an illuminated location or a non-illuminated location of the surface... due to electrostatic force” and “the deposited material chemically bonds to the photoconductive layer surface at the preferred location”, therefore the photoconductive layer includes a chemical layer that provides a reactive surface for compounds deposited on the surface; [57], where the photoconductive layer is protected);

whereby electric charge patterns may be formed in a selected array upon the substrate to influence the movement of charged droplets in a liquid medium on the substrate (p. 5, [43],

Art Unit: 1637

where the support, particularly the photoconductive layer, can be patterned with electric charge; p. 5, [41] where the support guides droplet placement on an array surface); the chemically functional layer providing a surface to which a binder molecule can be attached (p. 6, [47], [50], where the support “guides the ionized droplet of the material to preferentially deposit on an illuminated location or a non-illuminated location of the surface... due to electrostatic force” and “the deposited material chemically bonds to the photoconductive layer surface at the preferred location”, therefore the photoconductive layer includes a chemical layer that provides a reactive surface for compounds deposited on the surface; [57], where the photoconductive layer is protected).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 6 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over McEntee et al. (2004/0050701, March 2004; 102(e) date September 13, 2002) as applied to claims 1-5, 7-9 and 11-13 and further in view of (Salafsky et al. (US PgPub 2002/0094528 July 2002 102(e) date 11/29/00). McEntee teaches formation of arrays through electrostatic guidance of ionic samples (Abstract).

McEntee renders obvious all of the limitations of claims 1-5, 7-9 and 11-13. However, McEntee does not specifically teach the conductive layer and components of the chemical layer as claimed below. Salafsky teaches the formation of surface arrays which are used to detect probe and target interactions (Abstract).

With regard to claim 6, Salafsky teaches an embodiment of claim 1 wherein the conductive layer is selected from the group comprising a sputtered layer of metal or indium tin oxide, or a carbon nano-tube layer (paragraph 39, where the array comprises indium tin oxide).

With regard to claim 10, Salafsky teaches an embodiment of claim 1 wherein the chemically functional layer comprises a material selected from the group consisting of a silane polymer, silicon dioxide, silicon nitride (SixNy), titanium dioxide, organic titanates and zirconates, cross-linked or partially cross-linked epoxy novolac resins, polymerised oligomers, cross-linked resins, functionalised parylene (a polymer of di-para-xylyene), acrylates and methacrylates which may include functional groups, multi-functional acrylates and methacrylates, and monomers which have been crosslinked with a photoinitiator (paragraph 166, where a chemical layer provides functional layers on a surface which can be modified or adjusted for interaction with chemical interactions and where silica beads are covered by silanol groups as claimed).

It would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have adjusted the teachings of McEntee to include the specific conductive layer and chemical layer elements as taught and suggested by Salafsky to arrive at the claimed invention with a reasonable expectation for success. Regarding the conductive layer, as taught by Salafsky, "The surface arrays can be constructed according a plurality of methods found in

Art Unit: 1637

the art. For DNA microarrays, most are prepared with one of three non-standard approaches” (paragraph 38). Salafsky also teaches “The array substrate can be composed of glass, silicon, indium tin oxide, or any other substrate known in the art” (paragraph 39). Regarding the chemical layer element, Salafsky teaches, “a chemical layer which functionally derivatizes the surface of a solid support. For instance, the surface chemical groups can be changed by the derivatization layer according to the particular chemical functionality of the derivatizing agent” (paragraph 166). Salafsky also notes “a silica bead with negatively charged silanol groups on its surface can be converted to an amine-reactive, amine-containing, etc. surface via organosilane reagents” (paragraph 166). Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to have adjusted the teachings of McEntee to include the specific conductive layer and chemical layer elements as taught and suggested by Salafsky to arrive at the claimed invention with a reasonable expectation for success.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed March 16, 2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

First, Applicant traverses the claim interpretation. Applicant argues the features of a dielectric as “an electrical insulator that may be electrically charged by the action of an applied electrical field”. Regarding a photoconductor, Applicant argues the features as “one form of dielectric which has the same characteristics as a dielectric but also when light is shined onto it, causes the dielectric to conduct, thereby allowing any charge to dissipate”. Applicant concludes

Art Unit: 1637

that the meaning of these terms is well known and "the two terms are not interchangeable with one another" (p. 7 of remarks).

These arguments have been considered, but are not persuasive. While Applicant is correct that one of skill would understand the differences between the two terms, the claim interpretation is not arguing that these terms are always interchangeable. The claim interpretation is asserting that, in the context of this invention, in light of the teachings of the spec and the embodiments in the claims, the terms will be interpreted as interchangeable when it comes to a particular teaching in the art regarding certain layers of a substrate. Regarding this issue, the instant specification even states repeatedly "the dielectric or photoconductive layer..." followed by particular features of retaining or discharging charges (see p. 5 and 6 of specification). Therefore, while Applicant's arguments are appreciated, they are not persuasive and the rejection is maintained.

Applicant traverses the rejection of claims 1-5, 7-9 and 11-13 as being rejected under 102(e) as being anticipated by McEntee et al. Applicant argues "McEntee teaches a substrate where 'the deposited material chemically bonds to the photoconductive layer surface at the preferred location". Applicant also notes that "McEntee also expressly teaches that 'the deposited material chemically bonds to the [photoconductive] array surface at the preferred locations". Applicant concludes then "McEntee does not teach any separate chemically functional layer disposed on the dielectric/photoconductive layer that provides a protective layer for the dielectric/photoconductive layer" that is also chemically reactive (p. 8 of remarks).

Applicant also asserts that “although the substrate 110 in McEntee ‘may further comprise additional layers (not shown) for chemical, biological, mechanical or structural or other purposes’”, Applicant argues that “there is no teaching in McEntee that these possible additional layers should be on the front surface of the dielectric/photoconductive layer” and that they “could be on the back surface of the substrate” (p. 8 of remarks). Finally, Applicant contrasts McEntee with the substrate as claimed and reiterates the claims as amended and argue that McEntee does not teach all of the claim limitations as recited in the claims.

These arguments have been considered, but are not persuasive. First of all, it is noted that while Applicant focuses the force of the argument on the observation in McEntee that the deposited material chemically bonds to the photoconductive layer, it is noted in response that the same thing happens in Applicant’s invention. Therefore, while Applicant’s arguments are appreciated it is unclear from a careful reading of Applicant's specification how the teachings of McEntee and the teaching of the instant claims differ structurally following attachment. Regarding this issue, the specification states “An emulsion of the same composition as in the previous example was deposited on the surface, and subjected to the “coupling” procedure recommended by Eppendorf for its CreativeChip® Oligo slides. Coupling of the oligodeoxynucleotide to the slide was confirmed by scanning the slide in a GenePix 4000B (Axon Instruments Inc.), and identifying the mask pattern of **oligodeoxynucleotides coupled chemically onto the photoconductor surface**” (paragraph 84 of specification, emphasis added). Therefore, as the material attached to the substrate in the instant specification is “chemically bonded with the photoconductor surface” and the same type of attachment occurs in McEntee, this argument provides evidence of the similarity between the teachings and not the differences.

Next, it is noted that while Applicant is arguing against the rejection solely regarding the attachment of the deposited material to the photoconductive layer and the formation of the electrical charge as evidence of a lack of a chemical layer, it is noted that following attachment, the deposited molecules also meet the limitation of a “chemically functional layer”. Following attachment, these deposited molecules are “chemically attached” to the photoconductive layer and are distinct from the photoconductive layer and are chemically functional, which yields a substrate that includes each of the layers as claimed.

Also, the argued role of the chemical layer in protection of the photoconductive layer represents an intended use for the composition. In response to applicant's argument that the chemical layer of McEntee “does not protect the photoconductive layer”, a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In this case, the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use. Furthermore, as argued previously, while Applicant appears to be arguing that the chemical functional layer is present as a continuous layer, the claims do not require that the chemically functional layer is continuous or that it is present as a monolayer.

Finally, while Applicant's argument that McEntee does not teach that the additional chemical layer would or should be placed on the "front surface" of the dielectric/photoconductive layer, it is clear from the teachings of McEntee that, just like the instantly claimed invention, the chemical attachment does not occur to the "bottom" of the substrate, but on the other side where the electrostatic charge guides the binding of the molecules. Therefore, while the additional

Art Unit: 1637

features mentioned in paragraph 52, including biological layers, mechanical layers and other layers may be present in either orientation, it appears clear from the teaching of McEntee that any additional chemical layers would likely be applied on the surface upon which chemical reactions are occurring. Therefore, Applicant's arguments are not persuasive and the rejection is maintained.

Applicant traverses the rejection of claims 6 and 10 as being obvious over McEntee and Salafsky. Applicant argues "claim 1 has been shown to be patentable over McEntee" and "the claimed features are not taught by Salafsky" and that the combination would not make the invention of claim 1 obvious.

These arguments have been considered, but the arguments are not persuasive for the same reasons asserted above over claim 1 and the dependent claims.

Relevant Prior Art

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Mozorov et al. (US Patent 6,350,609) teaches array fabrication in the form of spots (Abstract). Loewy et al. (WO00/25936; May 2000) teaches a method for controlled electrostatic deposition of particles onto a substrate.

Conclusion

No claims are allowed. All claims stand rejected.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to STEPHANIE K. MUMMERT whose telephone number is (571)272-8503. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Benzion can be reached on 571-272-0782. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1637

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Stephanie K. Mummert/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1637

SKM